

### **IN THE DRAWINGS**

FIG. 2 is amended as described below by presenting Replacement Sheet as attached hereto.

In the Replacement Sheet of FIG. 2, element “ALR” has been modified to element “ARL” as described in the Specification of the present application. No new matter has been added.

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated October 10, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the drawings and claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3 claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 15, and 17 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention and claims 4, 6, and 8-10 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested. As will be discussed below, it is also requested that all of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 11-18 be found allowable as reciting patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 11-18 are pending and under consideration.

### **IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Please substitute the attached Replacement Sheet containing Fig. 2 for the original sheet of drawing filed in connection with the present application. In the Replacement Sheets of Fig. 2, element "ALR" has been replaced with element "ARL" as described in the Specification of the present application. No new matter has been added.

This amendment to the drawings is submitted to address the objections by the Examiner in the Office Action. The Examiner's approval of the attached Replacement Sheet is respectfully requested.

### **OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS:**

In the Office Action, at page 3, claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 15, and 17 were objected to for a minor informalities. Claims 1, 11, 15, and 17 have been amended to correct such minor informalities. Because claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled, the objections to these claims is rendered moot. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:**

In the Office Action, at page 4, claims 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. According to the Office Action, the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

The specification describes that the claimed method and system can be implemented in a switch 102 of a Local Area Network (LAN), which can be seen, for example, in Figure 1. Figure 1 provides support both for the “means-plus-function” features. Although Figure 1 does not explicit state that the switch includes “means-plus-function” features, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to recognize from the disclosure of Figure 1 and the description associated with Figure 3 that the switch would include various structural elements to perform the various functionalities being described.

Thus, although the specification does not use the terms “means-plus-function,” the specification fully supports claims 15-18.

Furthermore, the Federal Circuit has explained that “[t]he disclosure as originally filed does not ... have to provide in haec verba support for the claimed subject matter at issue.” *Cordis Corp. v. Medtronic AVE, Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1352, 1364, 67 USPQ2d 1876, 1885 (Fed. Cir. 2003); see additionally, *Kao Corp. v. Unilever United States, Inc.*, 78 USPQ2d 1257, 1260 (Fed. Cir. March 21, 2006). In other words, there is no requirement that the precise language used in the claims appear in the specification, in order to satisfy the written description requirement. Thus, the fact that the specification does not use the term “among each other” is of no consequence, and, therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 15-18 were not properly rejected under the enablement requirement. Rather, at most, the Specification alone should have been rejected. Specifically, according to 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, “the specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.” Thus, the referred portion of the statute is directed to the Specification, but it is not directed to the claim language. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection presented in the Office Action is improper because

claims 15-18 are being rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, rather than the Specification, and therefore it should be withdrawn.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:**

In the Office Action, at page 4, claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In response, claims 1-3, 5, and 7 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claims 4, 6, and 8-10 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 101 rejection to the claims be withdrawn.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

*In the Office Action, at page 5, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art on pages 1-3 of the specification ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,705 to Ullum et al. ("Ullum"). The Office Action took the position that AAPA and Ullum describe all the recitations of claims 1-18. It is respectfully asserted that, for at least the reasons provided herein below, AAPA and Ullum fail to teach or suggest the recitations of the pending claims. Reconsideration is requested.*

Dependent claims 4, 6, and 8-10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

Independent claim 11, upon which claims 12-14 are dependent, recites a method for forwarding an incoming frame in a network switch including, upon receiving an incoming frame, converting a MAC destination address and less significant bits of a VLAN identifier (VID) from the incoming frame into a 12 bit address resolution table (ARL) address which is used to access an address resolution table, and comparing an ARL VID and a MAC address from the address resolution table with the MAC destination address and less significant bits of the VID from the incoming frame to determine if there is an ARL hit. If there is an ARL hit, the method uses an action code from the address resolution table to determine at least one egress port to which the incoming frame is sent and uses the less significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame to access an appropriate entry in a VLAN table. The method also compares a VLAN VID from the VLAN table with more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame, wherein if the VLAN VID is the same as the more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame, there is a VLAN match, and forwards the incoming frame to at least one port based on at least one of the ARL hit and the VLAN match. method for forwarding an incoming frame in a network switch including, upon receiving an incoming frame, converting a MAC destination address and less significant bits of a VLAN identifier (VID) from the incoming frame into a 12 bit address resolution table (ARL) address which is used to access an address resolution table, and comparing an ARL VID and a

MAC address from the address resolution table with the MAC destination address and less significant bits of the VID from the incoming frame to determine if there is an ARL hit. If there is an ARL hit, the method uses an action code from the address resolution table to determine at least one egress port to which the incoming frame is sent and uses the less significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame to access an appropriate entry in a VLAN table. The method also compares a VLAN VID from the VLAN table with more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame, wherein if the VLAN VID is the same as the more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame, there is a VLAN match, and forwards the incoming frame to at least one port based on at least one of the ARL hit and the VLAN match.

Independent claim 15, upon which claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 16-18 are dependent, recites an apparatus for forwarding an incoming frame in a network switch including converting means for converting a MAC destination address and less significant bits of a VLAN identifier (VID) from an incoming frame into a 12 bit address resolution table (ARL) address which is used to access an address resolution table upon receiving the incoming frame. The apparatus includes comparing means for comparing an ARL VID and a MAC address from the address resolution table with the MAC destination address and less significant bits of the VID from the incoming frame to determine if there is an ARL hit. If there is an ARL hit, the apparatus further includes means for using an action code in the address resolution table to determine at least one egress port to which the incoming frame is sent, and means for using the less significant bits of the VID of the

incoming frame to access an entry in a VLAN table. The apparatus also includes comparing means for comparing a VLAN VID from the VLAN table with more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame, wherein if the VLAN VID is the same as the more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame, there is a VLAN match, and forwarding means for forwarding the incoming frame to at least one port based on at least one of the ARL hit and the VLAN match.

As will be discussed below, AAPA and Ullum fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

AAPA generally describes that upon receiving an incoming frame, the switch obtains the MAC destination address in registers (47:0) and the VID in registers (11:0) from the incoming frame. See paragraph [0004] of the specification of the present application. The incoming frame's MAC destination address in registers (47:0) and the VID in registers (11:0) are hashed to a 12 bit ARL address which is used to access the ARL table. Upon obtaining the appropriate entry in the ARL table, the switch compares the VID in registers (11:0) and MAC address in registers (47:0) in the ARL table with the incoming frame's VID in registers (11:0) and MAC destination address (47:0). If they are the same, then there is an ARL hit and the action code in the ARL table is used to determine which egress port(s) to send the incoming frame to. The incoming frame's VID in registers (11:0) is also used to access the VLAN table and the switch reads the forward map and the un-tag map from the VLAN entry that is associated with the VID. If there was an ARL hit and the ports indicated by the action code in the ARL table are



also active in the forward map, then the switch forwards the incoming frame to the identified egress port(s). If there was not a hit in the ARL table, but there was a match in the VLAN table, the switch uses the forward map in the VLAN table to forward the incoming frame to the appropriate destination port(s). If there was not a match in either the VLAN or ARL tables, the switch drops the frame.

However, as clearly provided in paragraph [0005] of the specification, the drawback of this implementation is that the VID has to be a continuous VLAN space. Therefore, as recited in independent claim 11, and similarly recited in independent claim 15, the method to forward an incoming frame in a network switch has been modified so that “upon receiving an incoming frame, converting a MAC destination address **and less significant bits of a VLAN identifier (VID) from the incoming frame** into a 12 bit address resolution table (ARL) address which is used to access an address resolution table.” Contrary to the Office Action’s contention that AAPA describes such features, AAPA does not teach or suggest the conversion of the MAC destination address and less significant bits of a VLAN identifier (VID) from the incoming frame.

Furthermore, AAPA does not teach or suggest, at least, “comparing an ARL VID and a MAC address from the address resolution table with the MAC destination address **and less significant bits of the VID** from the incoming frame to determine if there is an ARL hit,” and “if there is an ARL hit, using an action code from the address resolution table to determine at least one egress port to which the incoming frame is sent,” as recited in independent claim 11 and similarly recited in independent claim 15. (Emphasis added)

AAPA is devoid of any teaching or suggestion that the ARL VID and a MAC address from the address resolution table with the MAC destination address and less significant bits of the VID from the incoming frame are compared to determine if there is an ARL hit.

Furthermore, the Office Action correctly recognized that AAPA fails to teach or suggest the use of the significant bits and the comparison as recited in independent claims 11 and 15. Accordingly, the Office Action relied on Ullum.

Ullum generally describes a look-up mechanism for storing and retrieving forwarding information used to transport data frames among ports of a high-performance network switch. The look-up mechanism includes a look-up table having a multi-page architecture that is accessed in accordance with a dual hashing technique. The dual hashing technique first assigns a mapping between a first virtual page to the physical page of the look-up table to be initially accessed. Secondly, the hashing technique points to a particular entry (or line) in the table on that identified page. The dual hashing technique is used for both initially storing and for ultimately retrieving information from the look-up table. Use of the technique increases the likelihood that a match will be found on a first look up operation to the table.

Furthermore, Ullum provides that a hash key 458 is used as an address 564 for the data RAM 340 (FIG. 3). See column 7, lines 22-40. As illustrated in FIG. 5 of Ullum, the most significant bits (MSBs), e.g., bits 14, 15 and 16 of hash value 458, are preferably used to identify the VFP to access in RAM 340. Specifically, the MSBs are transposed

into the least significant bits (LSBs) of the RAM address 564 and decoded (mod 2 ) to identify one of physical pages 0 through 7 of the data RAM 340 as the virtual first page associated with the particular MAC address/VLAN pair.

However, rather than providing a comparison of the **VLAN ID from a VLAN table with more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame** to determine whether a VLAN match exists between the VLAN ID and the more significant bits as recited in independent claims 11 and 15, Ullum provides the MSBs of hash value 458 are transposed into the least significant bits (LSBs) of the RAM address 564 to identify one of physical pages 0 through 7 of the data RAM 340 as the virtual first page. Because Ullum does not define “transposing,” one can only conclude that the term is to be defined as well known in the art. By definition, transposing is a change in a relative position, order, or sequence, to interchange; cause to change places; an interchange. However, transposing is not determined to be a comparison of two factors. Therefore, Ullum does not teach or suggest a comparison of the MSBs with the LSBs of the RAM address 564. Furthermore, the result of the transposition of the MSBs with the LSBs of the RAM address 564 in Ullum is to identify one of physical pages 0 through 7 of the data RAM 340 as the virtual first page. Nothing in Ullum teaches or suggests that if the MSBs is **the same as** the LSBs of the RAM address 564, there is a VLAN match as in the present application. Therefore, Ullum does not cure the deficiencies of AAPA.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a combination of AAPA and Ullum fails to teach or suggest, “forwarding the incoming frame to at least one port based

on at least one of the ARL hit and the VLAN match,” as recited in independent claim 11 and similarly recited in independent claim 15. AAPA fails to teach or suggest features associated with the comparison as recited in independent claims 11 to determine the ARL hit and Ullum fails to teach or suggest that the VLAN match when the VLAN VID is the same as the more significant bits of the VID of the incoming frame. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art can only conclude that a combination of AAPA and Ullum would fail to teach or suggest the forwarding as recited in independent claims 11 and 15.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that AAPA and Ullum, individually or combined, fail to teach or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 11 and 15 and related dependent claims.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 11 and 15 and related dependent claims be allowed.


### **CONCLUSION:**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants further submit that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unobvious to a person of skill in the art. Applicants therefore respectfully request that each of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 11-18 be found allowable and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Alicia M. Choi  
Registration No. 46,621

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

AMC/ksh/dc